

### REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 15 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §112, rejected claims 15, 16, 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 6,961,880 (Frankowsky) in view of United States Patent Publication 2003/0237061 (Miller), and rejected claims 17, 20 and 23-26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frankowsky in view of Miller and further in view of United States Patent No. 6,999,357 (Tanishima et al.).

Claims 15 and 21 are independent. Claim 15 has been amended (claim 21 has been similarly amended) such that it now specifically claims: performing a first test, wherein functional memory is tested; repairing the functional memory by adding access to redundant elements, thereby providing repaired functional memory; performing a second test, wherein the repaired functional memory is tested; after repairing the functional memory and after testing the repaired functional memory, adding access to redundant memory not required for repair of the functional memory; and performing a third test, wherein the redundant memory is tested.

Applicant respectfully submits that this is neither disclosed or suggested by the prior art. For example, Frankowsky discloses testing the functional memory, repairing the functional memory, testing the repaired functional memory and, at the same time, testing unused redundant elements. Frankowsky does not disclose or suggest what is now being specifically claimed:

performing a first test, wherein functional memory is tested;

repairing the functional memory by adding access to redundant elements, thereby providing repaired functional memory;

performing a second test, wherein the repaired functional memory is tested; and  
after repairing the functional memory and after testing the repaired functional memory, adding access to redundant memory not required for repair of the functional memory; and performing a third test, wherein the redundant memory is tested.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the present application be passed to issuance.

Should the present claims not be deemed adequate to effectively define the patentable subject matter, the Examiner is respectfully urged to call the undersigned attorney of record to discuss the claims in an effort to reach an agreement toward allowance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 20, 2009

By: 

James R. Foley, Reg. No. 39,979  
Trexler, Bushnell, Giangiorgi,  
Blackstone & Marr, Ltd.  
105 W. Adams Street, 36th Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60603  
(312) 704-1890